

MC 84/24

IDRC REGIONAL OFFICES - THEIR HISTORY AND RESPONSIBILITIES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
A. HISTORY	
1. Dates of Establishment	1
2. Patterns of Growth	1-2
B. DECENTRALIZATION	
1. Definition	2
2. Justification and Benefits	3
3. Comparative Costs	3-4
4. Alternative Patterns	4
5. Sub Offices	4
6. Rates of Growth	5
C. FUNCTIONS	
1. Organization, Management and Administration	6
2. Representational	6-7
3. Regional Intelligence - Research Environment	7-8
4. Support to Divisions	8-9
5. Phase C	9-10
6. Evaluations of Programs and Projects	10-11
7. Planning for the Future	11-13
8. Possible new activities	13-14
9. Interdivisional cooperation	14-15
D. BUDGETS - REGIONAL OFFICE FUNDS	
1. General	15-17
2. Program Support	15-17
3. Other activities	15-17
E. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION	
1. Libraries and Documentation	17-19
2. Between ROs and HQ	19-20
3. Between ROs and Regional Institutions	20
F. STAFF - MANAGEMENT AND LOCAL	
1. Regional Director	20-21
2. Deputy Director	22
3. Controller	22
4. Support staff	22-23
G. PROGRAM STAFF	
1. Selection, allocation	23-24
2. Briefing, training	24-25
3. Authority, Responsibility	25-26
4. Staff Development Leave	26-27
5. Family conditions and privileges	27



A264W
HULS8
no. 96

APPENDIX "A"

TABLE 1. The Countries Covered by the Regional Offices

TABLE 2.A-F. Population, Projects and Salary Costs

TABLE 3.A-F. Staff and Office Space Projections

TABLE 4. Comparative Study - Costs of Sending and Keeping Program Officers at Regional Offices

TABLE 5. Analysis of Inflation vs. Devaluation by Regional Offices

TABLE 6. Regional Director's Discretionary Fund

APPENDIX "B"

The Ford Foundation

ABBREVIATIONS

CD COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION
DRD DEPUTY REGIONAL DIRECTOR
HQ HEADQUARTERS
PA PROGRAM ASSISTANTS
PD PROGRAM DIRECTOR
PO PROGRAM OFFICER
RC REGIONAL CONTROLLER
RDDF/ROF FUNDS AT RD's DISCRETION
RD REGIONAL DIRECTOR
RO REGIONAL OFFICE

13 June 1984

REGIONAL OFFICE REVIEW

BACKGROUND

No specific terms of reference were laid down for the study of the ROs. Consequently, no formal questionnaire was drawn up. During a visit to each RO (except SARO) lengthy but unstructured interviews with all staff available, including support staff, produced the contents of the report to be presented under the Contents listed and attached Appendices (presented as Tables 1-6) and Appendix "B".

Discussions in HQ were principally with VPs, PDs, and with several who have lived and worked in ROs. All who made comments and recommendations were guaranteed anonymity.

HISTORY

The first RO was to be in New Delhi but necessary privileges and immunities could not be guaranteed in 1971. ASRO opened in December 1971, LARO in August 1972. First consideration was for a single African/Middle East office in Addis Ababa, but the political situation resulted in (a) WARO in May 1973; (b) MERO (Beirut) November 1974 (to Cairo July 1977); (c) EARO May 1975 (Closed 1978; reopened October 1980). SARO opened June 1983.

Patterns of growth have never been planned by the Centre's management or by ROs. The number of POs from Program Divisions out-posted has been at the discretion of the Program Directors, the ROs responding by providing the space and secretarial support needed. Only AFNS has consistently posted POs to ROs.

At first, ASRO and MERO (Beirut) were the fastest growing. ASRO maintained a fairly steady rate of growth but MERO declined rapidly with the move to Cairo, some staff being moved to WARO, some to Ottawa.

The first RD was a part-time appointment, Lang Wong (a Canadian of Chinese origin) being principally the project leader of TECHNONET. The earliest full-time RDs were mature people chosen for their extensive contacts with senior government officials in their regions. It is doubtful if the Centre took full advantage of their experience and contacts. Consequently, their functions were largely as official representatives and good will ambassadors.

The exact scope and limits of RDs and ROs responsibilities and functions has never been precisely defined. Consequently, patterns of management style and function have largely reflected the character, initiative and enthusiasm of the RD. The need is clearly apparent, without undue constraint upon imagination, initiative and flexibility, to develop and implement a more orderly system of forward planning. The responsibilities of the RDs and ROs; their patterns of growth; their relations with the President's Committee, OPE, the Program and service divisions and indeed with one another, need careful consideration, planning and an orderly system of implementation. The Centre is now too large and too diffuse to permit all Divisions and ROs to proceed as relatively independent units.

The most urgent task for the President's Committee is to develop a long term plan for the ROs, and indeed for all other Centre Divisions, a plan that is comprehensive, consistent and orderly but which does not cramp the scientific creativity or flexibility upon which IDRC has built its reputation.

The remainder of this summary will consist of a brief listing of the principal comments and recommendations recorded.

B. DECENTRALIZATION

1. Definition

Among Centre staff, "decentralization" is interpreted differently and regarded with widely differing degrees of enthusiasm. Alternatively it is interpreted as:

- 1) Greater delegation of authority and larger budgets to RDs to finance a broader range of activities including various regional and country studies (regional intelligence, research environment, program and project evaluations, planning and policy formulation), support for small projects, institutional support, in-house projects, regional associations and publications;
- 2) More Program Division staff to be posted to ROs;
- 3) Greater delegation of authority by Program Directors to POs posted to ROs.

All require serious discussion with both RDs and PDs. In general, though they vary widely, staff who have always been at HQ appear less enthusiastic about decentralization by any of the above definitions than are the RDs.

2. Justification and Benefits

A larger presence in the developing regions is consistent with IDRC's stated purpose and style. ROs are more consistently aware of LDCs changing needs and opportunities. Large Ottawa bureaucracies are not renowned for imaginative innovation. The Centre's ultimate objective should be to go out of business leaving regional and national organizations able to manage their own applied research. POs based in ROs were almost unanimous in the belief that they function more effectively in an RO than from Ottawa: they claim better contacts with recipients, governments, etc.; greater awareness of research requirements, activities of other agencies; better opportunities for interdivisional cooperation. Given IDRC's responsibility to support developing country research and development, increases in program staff in the ROs are less subject to adverse criticism than growth in Ottawa.

When the majority of POs are based in Ottawa is there not a greater danger of projects and programs being formulated in Ottawa and sold to recipients? LDC priorities need careful systematic study and should not be assumed on the basis of casual visits and limited contacts. Some ROs support series of workshops to review and recommend upon sectoral priorities. This is a valuable service to Centre Divisions that deserves encouragement.

3. Comparative Costs

Several attempts at cost-benefit analysis were unfruitful. One-time costs of delivering a PO, spouse and two children from Ottawa to an RO are between \$19,000 and \$21,000 CAD. Annual costs (excluding education) range from \$31,000 (EARO) to \$47,000 (ASRO) per officer, spouse plus two (including home leave and attendance at staff meetings). (see Table 4).

AFNS estimates duty travel costs (transportation, hotel, per diem) as \$240 per day for Canadian-based POs, \$190/day for LARO and EARO, \$200/day for ASRO, MERO and WARO POs.

In general, support staff salaries are lower in ROs than in HQ. It is not evident however that with increases in ROs appropriate reductions in staff costs occur in HQ. There is suggestion of duplication of activities in some areas.

Some suggest that a greater burden is imposed on HQ staff as more POs are moved to ROs. In some measure such burdens upon remaining POs can be lightened by delegating more administrative responsibilities to support staff. In addition, the need is urgent to simplify the systems by which project and other essential documents are prepared and administered in HQ. All Divisions are suffering from an excessive load of paper.

Though a conventional cost-benefit analysis is not readily applied to an RO, a small RO (eg. MERO) is probably less economic than one with a large complement of POs (eg. ASRO). The ratio of administrative to program activities is higher in the former than the latter.

Costs of office space, actual and predicted, are appended in Tables 3.A - 3.F.

4. Alternative Patterns

In Appendix "B" a brief review of the Ford Foundation's style is compared with IDRC's. It is not recommended that IDRC's specialized sectoral organization and program responsibilities be changed significantly. It is recommended that all divisions be encouraged to increase the numbers of POs in ROs; that information and library services be significantly decentralized to the ROs; that in-house training and briefing programs be set in motion to prepare ROs more rapidly to assume Phase C responsibilities; that Internal Audit examine the obstacles to more rapid and efficient assumption of Phase C responsibilities. There is more detailed reference to training and briefing for service in ROs under Sections F and G.

It is emphasized that the first essential to increased autonomy in the ROs is adequate ability to administer existing projects at the Phase C level. Divisional POs should be professionally experienced and mature and adequately briefed in essential management procedures and granted sufficient authority to act effectively without constant reference to HQ.

Any shifts of responsibility and/or staff between HQ and the ROs need to take place in a gradual and orderly fashion. Movements at short notice cause disruption.

5. Sub-offices

Small sub-offices in the regions are not generally recommended though there may be special instances where a PO can work more effectively from an institution outside the RO. These should be the exception and recommended strictly to achieve working efficiency not to avoid personality conflicts or to suit personal convenience.

Several staff recommended greater decentralization of IDRC staff to suitable locations across Canada.

6. Rates of Growth (see Tables 3A-3F)

Not all ROs were prepared to predict long term growth patterns but the more experienced consider an optimum eventual size of about 25 professionals and 35-40 support staff; up to four new POs being posted each year to each RO, provided the postings are notified at least one year ahead.

Staffing patterns as of 1984-3-31 as follows:

	ASRO	LARO	WARO	EARO	MERO	SARO
RD	1	1	1	1	1	1
DRD	1	1	-	-	-	-
LIB	1	-	-	-	-	-
ADMINOFF	1	-	1	1	1	1
SUPPORT	28	25	16	16	7	5
SUBTOTAL	32	27	18	18	9	7
AFNS	4	4	2	4	1	2
SS	2	1	1	2	1	-
HS	2	-	-	-	-	-
IS	2	-	-	-	-	-
COMM	1	1	1	1	-	-
FAD	1	-	-	1	-	-
CGT	1	1	1	1	-	-
SUBTOTAL	12	7	5	9	2	2
TOTAL	44	34	23	27	11	9

Staff training and responsibilities are discussed under F and G. It is considered more economic to employ as many Program Assistants (Program Administrators) as necessary than to require POs to devote their time to minor administrative activities. A high ratio of POs to support staff is therefore not necessarily the most economical.

Space requirements have been estimated at 15-20m²/person dependent on the nature of the premises. An office building is generally more efficient and economic of space than a converted house or apartment.

The following are the numbers that could probably be accommodated in the existing available space:

MERO	25-30
LARO	60-65
ASRO	50-55
EARO	60-65 (after proposed expansion)
SARO	40
WARO	Difficult to estimate because of the internal lay-out and the interdiction against removing walls and plumbing facilities.

C. FUNCTIONS

1. Management and Administration

Though each has drawn up an operations and administration manual, patterns of organization, management style and allocation of responsibilities vary, each reflecting the character and disposition of the RD. Recommendations on briefing and training particularly for RD, DRDs and Controllers new to the Centre are presented later. Apart from CGT directives, in recent years less attention has been given to management and administration than to the ROs involvement in planning, evaluation and intelligence gathering though, as indicated below, none of these seems to have been uniformly or systematically defined. Without seeking identical clones, a clearer definition of responsibilities and authority and more precise guidance in management practices, particularly for new colleagues, seems highly desirable. The Centre should give as much attention to management training of its own staff as to program recipients.

With the reorganization each RD needs to know precisely to whom he responds, what are the limits and scope of his authority, what are the approved functions of each RO both immediately and over the next five years. Clear directives to and consistent management systems within each RO are prerequisites for whatever pattern of decentrallized authority are to be put in place.

Responsibilities among RO staff are referred to later but not all are equally well defined. Furthermore, internal communications within ROs and communications between ROs and HQ vary in style and effectiveness. All ROs have established internal committees. Some function systematically and meet regularly; others appear to exist more in name than in fact.

2. Representational

Representing the President, the Centre and its component Divisions continues to absorb 30-40% of the RDs' time. As public

relations agents the RDs have been extremely effective. In some ROs the representational responsibilities might be more systematically distributed, DRDs, AOs and PAs being trained to take their share. Most evident is the need for carefully selected Communications Division staff to act as PR Officers and professional communicators. A trained CD PR Officer, well experienced in the geography, cultures and characteristics of the region provides a valuable service if given the freedom of authority to develop an imaginative technical information and public relations program for each RO.

The countries represented by each RO should be reviewed each year and transfers made where desirable. Immediately Angola should become the responsibility of EARO. Other transfers among EARO, WARO and MERO possibly of countries, probably of some projects, should be considered as workloads and staffing patterns change.

Very careful coordination of ASRO and SARO activities will be necessary until SARO is fully able to administer the large volume of projects in its allotted area.

3. Regional Intelligence - The Research Environment

A very large quantity of information passes into each RO, some by request (one RO canvasses over 70 institutions twice each year; all receive a variety of journals and other publications) some unsolicited. Other sources are project and trip reports, proceedings of conferences, workshops, meetings; consultant reports; activities of other donors and development agencies; conversations with visitors and so on.

The ROs have been encouraged to increase their pursuit of regional intelligence and studies of what is vaguely described as the "research environment". Recommendations on the processing of these many documents appears under E - Information and Communications. At present some ROs are being overwhelmed with documents and information. The ROs need much clearer indications of what information is essential to the Centre's present and future programs.

Masses of statistics about research institutes, their employees and budgets are not generally very useful unless accompanied by reliable professional assessments of the nature and quality of their work; the qualifications and experience of their staff. Statements of research priorities vary according to source: government bureaucrats often having different ideas than academic scientists.

In exploring the research environment, IDRC needs to be highly selective in defining what needs to be known. Carefully planned sectoral profile studies, as proposed by HS, can be very useful provided the ROs and any consultants engaged are very carefully briefed.

Given the growing interest in biotechnology, high technologies, energy generation and conservation, and industrial development, some priority might be given to more accurate assessments of human resources needed, available and under training. The rough data available from UNESCO suggests a serious crisis and severe competition in many countries for an inadequate supply of post-graduates experienced in the natural, physical and health sciences and in engineering.

Several ROs recommend the creation of regional advisory councils to study and recommend upon matters of particular concern. These, to be financed from ROF, could engage consultants and could comment constructively upon IDRC's past and existing programs and future probable demands.

Whatever alternative mechanisms may be employed to collect, collate and analyze information in the ROs, urgent and immediate attention needs to determine precisely what information is needed by the President's Committee, by the different Centre Divisions, by the ROs, and possibly by the Board of Governors.

It is recommended that a special session with the Regional Directors be devoted to this and other alternative responsibilities for the ROs during the October meeting of the Management Committee.

4. Support to Program Divisions

The Centre's reputation was built and rests upon scientific quality: upon support for competent applied research, identified and where necessary assisted by Program Division Officers well qualified and experienced to recognize competence from mediocrity. Therefore support for the Program Divisions remains the most important function of the ROs.

In the early years, RO support was administrative and logistic. More recently, where RDs with Centre experience were appointed, the support has broadened and deepened. Administrative and financial monitoring (including pursuit of MGCs, progress and financial reports) are better fulfilled from ROs than HQ. Grant payments and administrative decisions are generally better handled from the ROs than HQ, provided there is an adequate complement of Divisional POs resident in the RO. ROs are more sensitive to local conditions and their advice on regional issues and concerns should be taken seriously (for example, ROs know better than HQ which types of vehicle are best suited to different territories.)

While first priority should be to strengthen the ROs administrative and financial support to projects and Program Divisions, RO support should extend beyond purely logistic and routine administration. RO advice is important on projects or actions likely to be politically sensitive. Prior notice of travel plans and projects in the pipeline enables ROs to give timely advice and to discourage such embarrassments as different Divisions presenting the Centre in a different light to the same institution. RDs and Regional Controllers should draw up standardized procedures and rules concerning topping up of salaries, levels of "overhead" for all institutions in all countries of the region.

Communications between HQ and the ROs, particularly on proposed travel, on projects being considered or negotiated, and in timely reporting of visits to the regions is highly variable and for the most part unsatisfactory. The Centre advises others on systems of communications while our own internal communications are far from satisfactory.

Identification of projects, of competent scientists and institutions and of scientific monitoring remains the full responsibility of the Program Divisions. But with adequate consultation and advance notice of Divisional plans, pipeline projects, negotiations in progress and other matters of relevance, the ROs can improve their already valuable support to Divisions.

5. Phase C

Though Phase C has no consistent pattern, the principle of expanding ROs' responsibility for financial and administrative management of projects is sound. The rate at which Phase C activities can be absorbed depends upon the knowledge and experience of the RD, the DRD and/or AO, the Controller and the prior training given to support staff, particularly Program Assistants.

An accountant's classical cost:benefit analysis of Phase C activities is not feasible but a detailed review of Phase C experience in ASRO and LARO seems highly necessary to help other ROs avoid difficulties encountered elsewhere. Internal Audit should give particular attention to difficulties and constraints to Phase C efficiency and report these to the VP Resources for consideration by the President's and/or Management Committee.

Clearly, successful Phase C requires experienced well trained RO staff and a sufficient number of Divisional POs - at least two from each Program Division.

Program Assistants (now to be called Program Administrators?) are essential where significant CAP budgets are involved (in EARO 48% of AFNS project budgets are CAP). As an RO moves to Phase C training of selected local staff to become Program Assistants should begin immediately and be given systematically. As stated later, HR need to address the matter of training of support staff in ROs.

Some ROs find great difficulty in purchasing and delivering equipment within the region. Currency transfers and wide variations between official and unofficial exchange rates call for legal but innovative ways of circumventing these difficulties without undue cost to the Centre.

A review of equipment purchasing and delivery particularly where difficult currency and import regulations exist, seems necessary. In a friendly diplomatic but firm manner, certain governments need to be advised by the ROs that their own bureaucracies are a major impediment to their research institutions' ability to benefit from IDRC support.

6. Evaluations of Programs and Projects

Virtually every Centre unit engages in assessments and evaluations. Some are systematic, others ad hoc. Planning and Evaluation are proposed as important tasks for the ROs. What is intended by either activity is not uniformly understood across the Centre or among the ROs. Program Divisions and CGT monitor and evaluate ongoing projects, the RO involvement being largely through regional Controllers and accountants; through POs and PAs resident in ROs. Some ROs have cooperated with PDs and OPE in specific evaluations but no unique evaluative role for the ROs is in evidence.

Post-project evaluations of impact upon development are desirable since in many cases it is difficult to predict the potential influence upon development when a project is first formulated.

It is suggested the ROs be given specific responsibility for evaluating projects one or more years following completion. These would include:

- (a) Sizeable projects, groups, or networks of related projects;
- (b) Countries, ministries and institutions with several completed projects.

The purpose would be to determine what continued when IDRC support ended; what benefits ("impact") were realized; how research results were used; did any development investment result. The evaluations would be concerned not with research methodology but with outcome. It is suggested that these evaluations be carried out by carefully chosen consultants from the region and that they not be predominantly specialists in directly related scientific fields. Though prior discussion is needed with the Program Divisions, with OPE, and particularly with the government and institutions concerned, it is recommended that as the capacity to do so is acquired, ROs be given freedom to initiate post-completion evaluations. In addition their valuable cooperation with Divisions in sectoral profile studies and specifically requested evaluations should continue. However, longer term planning of the ROs evaluation activities is recommended.

It is also recommended each RD convene once each year a regional advisory council composed of up to 10 experienced people from ministries of planning, economic development, science and technology and research institutions to review and comment upon IDRC's apparent priorities: what is being over-emphasized or neglected. These may be regarded as evaluations of IDRC through the eyes of its principal clients.

It was also suggested that ROs encourage evaluations by local consultants of the influence of international and regional research agencies' projects, heavily dependent upon expatriates upon national research and development projects. It is questionable however if this should be a high priority.

It is firmly believed that by first acquiring experience in defining, formulating and executing evaluations of various completed projects and from the advice of regional advisory councils the RDs and ROs will become better equipped to contribute effectively to the Centre's future planning process.

As stated later, these and all other major activities should be proposed in each RO's annual program of work and budget.

7. Planning

All ROs seek to devote more effort to "planning". It is not always clear whether planning exercises are intended for the Centre's future or to guide developing countries in formulating their science and technology policies. The ROs may contribute to the Centre's planning process by information gathered, by post-completion evaluations and from regional advisory councils referred to above. But first the President's Committee, in consultation with OPE, needs to formulate a systematic planning process in which the ROs' functions are clearly defined. Not each

RO is equally equipped in resources or experience to embark on long-range planning or policy formulation exercises. It is doubtful if many in the Centre have extensive active experience in the planning of science and technology policies at a national level.

The ROs are better located than HQ to seek out developing nations' priorities, their institutional and human resources. But time and effort will be wasted if each RO pursues planning and policy studies before the Centre has clearly defined what information is needed for its own future planning. To what if any extent IDRC should pursue the role of adviser to developing countries in planning their science and technology policies needs very careful consideration. Alternatively, carefully conceived specific regional studies could provide governments with information helpful to their science and technology planning. The expectations aroused by the publicity given to various biotechnologies, electronics, energy generation, communications, industrial development and the continued growth of armaments investments promise a serious crisis in demand for people trained in natural, medical and physical sciences and in engineering. Consultants working from ROs could determine the numbers trained, being trained and the facilities for training to the level of competence needed to supply the proposed demand. Specific and sharply focussed studies could be useful both to governments and to IDRC's future planning in addition to being more manageable than comprehensive essays in national science policy planning.

To question IDRC's ability to advise governments upon their science policy is in no sense a denigration of SS support for science and technology policy research. But to offer services as planning and policy advisers assumes a technical assistance function that demands an experienced labour intensiveness the Centre could not afford. Given the constraints upon staff the trend in some Centre units towards labour intensive technical assistance activities should be very carefully scrutinized.

A thoughtful paper on Centre planning was prepared by the RD LARO for the RDs' meeting. It emphasized the hazards of top-down planning as opposed to grass-roots planning in a Centre which seeks to be responsive to LDC demands. The paper deserves serious consideration by the President's Committee.

The Centre is in danger, however, of becoming so balkanized that every Division, every RO is planning independently. It is strongly recommended that the information needed for planning should originate from the grass roots: from the Program Divisions and the ROs. Comprehensive Centre planning however should be by the President's Committee based upon the recommendations, advice

and information from the grass roots. The President's Committee needs urgently to devote considerable thought to the Centre's planning process in light of (a) its evident future commitments; (b) the new demands forthcoming from the ERG studies; the establishment of various institutes of biotechnology; requirements of the NICs; and (c) the apparent serious inadequacy of appropriately trained people to meet these new demands without prejudice to existing agricultural, health and industrial programs most of which already have inadequate resources.

8. Possible New Activities

New activities proposed by and for ROs are many and if all were adopted, significantly larger staffs would be needed. The ambitiousness of the RDs is to be encouraged but, in some cases, guidance is needed to help choose out of all that seems desirable that which is most essential. (see Section D, p. 15 and 17)

To be responsible for program activities is the understandable ambition of every unit in the Centre, not the least the ROs. Different RDs propose they be responsible for various in-house projects; projects that fall outside existing Divisions; exploratory projects to lead to new Centre activities; institutional grants; support for regional associations and journals; grants to young research workers; and various others. Several appear very labour intensive, some overlap with existing Divisions, but most have merit and several deserve consideration after more precise formulation.

Grants to institutions, as distinct from specific projects, deserves a special study contracted by the President's Committee in consultation with OPE. The number of institutions, regional associations and journals far exceed what IDRC could support with its present resources. Financial support for journals tends inevitably to be open ended and interminable and such proposals should be carefully examined by the CD representative in the RO. Grants to young researchers needs consideration by FAD.

A wish to engage in research management studies and training has been expressed by some RDs. Again, we meet a term that needs definition and a common understanding. In theory, given the breadth of disciplines and administrative knowledge in the Centre and research management experience in Canada, the Centre should be able to offer help in what is a greatly neglected area. Nevertheless, it requires first a serious in-house study of the resources necessary and available and how, if at all, they can be marshalled and organized to serve a useful purpose. In the meantime, various ad hoc independent activities should not be encouraged.

ROs should be encouraged to state their ambitions and to describe the changes in their responsibilities they consider desirable. But as with all new proposals, these must be considered in light of existing work loads, what additional staff and resources will be needed or what changes in resource allocations are proposed within the RO and/or within other Centre activity units. New activities of significant scale should be examined by the Management Committee at its October meeting.

The small grants project based in EARO seems an effective means of disbursing a sizeable project budget in a series of locally approved small grants. Though it relies upon RO supporting services, the administrative load does not appear excessive. Where RO office space is limited, similar projects could be housed in other space nearby, the rent being charged to the project. The many applications for small grants present an interesting spectrum of what young scholars consider to be important research priorities.

Particular attention should be given to the means of employing regional consultants and advisers on term contracts or for 2-3 months annually to carry out some of the exploratory activities suggested. However, whatever new activities are set in motion, the Centre should not lower its standards or lose its reputation for sound professional judgement in identifying, formulating, monitoring and evaluating the activities its supports.

Finally, the ROs are by no means all equally endowed, staffed or experienced to carry out the various new activities proposed. All appear fully occupied with their existing commitments. All of them work extremely long hours. Consequently, adoption of new activities will require careful assessment of existing commitments and resources and a carefully planned phasing in of any significant new responsibilities.

9. Interdivisional cooperation

Interdivisional cooperation was easier when the Centre was small in numbers. Similarly, in ROs, POs are more accessible to one another and since they cover mainly the same territory enjoy more opportunity for cooperation and exchange of information. Effective cooperation depends upon each Division being adequately represented and each PO being delegated sufficient authority to speak and act confidently.

Interdivisional discussion becomes more difficult yet more essential as what were originally service Divisions (CGT, Communications, Legal) engage in program activities. There are several instances of different Divisions approaching the same

institution unknown to one another and in more than one case working to different administrative rules. As already suggested, RDs should have standard administrative policies and procedures covering all institutions, trainees and consultants in their region. They may vary among countries according to government regulations or accepted practices, but they should be applied uniformly across IDRC's Divisions.

Interdivisional cooperation requires: (a) sufficient early warning to RDs and POs in the ROs of projects in the pipeline, negotiations in progress, travel plans and institutions to be visited; (b) frankness between POs in ROs; and (c) regularly scheduled meetings in the ROs.

Meetings in ROs convened and chaired by the RD are essential but useful only if planned with an agenda sufficiently ahead of time that everyone attends and is prepared. Program review meetings are necessary at least twice each year with revised project pipeline lists from each Division being circulated every three months. Divisions not represented by resident POs should send their updated project pipeline lists together with brief notes of information ROs need to know.

Overlapping program interests among and within Divisions are evident in several sectors. The opportunities are more favourable in the ROs than in HQ to encourage cooperation and to derive benefit rather than conflict from overlapping interests.

Interdivisional cooperation need not entail larger numbers of interdivisional projects. These are more constrained by the desires and abilities of recipients to undertake projects across sectors than of the Centre to support them. Projects or activities that complement an existing project are often more easily and beneficially implemented than attempts at complex multidisciplinary undertakings.

Essential to interdivisional cooperation in the ROs is that the RO establish mechanisms for reliable internal communications, that the RDs keep themselves well informed and that everyone has ready access to what they need to know. The first and most important responsibility of an RD is to run the RO efficiently.

D. BUDGETS AND RO FUNDS

In 1984-85 the total operating budget of the ROs is \$4.2M. In 1983-84 the ROs' budgets were roughly 3.6% of total Centre appropriations. The total Regional Office Funds (ROF) budget for 1984-85 is \$755,000, an increase of 29% over 1983-84. The ROF supports three broad activities:

- I Planning and Evaluation
- II Program Support
- III General activities

In the three fiscal years 1981-82 - 83-84, ASRO supported 134 activities. In 1983-84, approximately 13% were in category I, 37% in II, and 50% in III. A summary of ROF activities appears in Table 6 of Appendix "A".

All but one RO believe they could have committed a larger ROF allocation during 1983-84. Most would like their DAP limit increased from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

Though there is no hint of waste or abuse, the manner in which the ROF is allocated varies among ROs. In one RO about 75% of ROF is appropriated on the recommendation of resident POs. In some ROs, ROF DAPs are circulated for a week before approval. Though RO committees to approve DAPs are desirable, in small offices these are inhibited by constant travel. In larger offices a weekly review of DAPs by a committee of the RD or DRD, the Controller and whichever POs are at home is recommended. Allowing the ROs to employ the ROF largely at their discretion is highly desirable, particularly for program support and general activities. As stated above, a clearer understanding is needed of what is required for planning, evaluation and knowledge of the research environment. Collecting information that is not profitably used leads to discouragement and frustration.

Since most of the ROF goes to program support, the allocation to each RO should be roughly proportional to the number of resident POs. However, if and when the planning and evaluation responsibility becomes more sharply defined, the proportion allocated to these functions will probably increase.

In some instances ROF is not easily distinguishable from a program Division DAP. Overlap does not appear serious since most such DAPs are requested or cleared by the Division involved. Approval of requests by ROs that had been rejected by PDs seem relatively few.

The ROF permits ROs to respond quickly to local needs. However, some activities - workshops and major consultancies, take time and a pipeline list from each, revised quarterly, and circulated by the RO Coordinator would help keep everyone informed.

Some RDs would like to have program budgets to support RO projects in addition to ROF DAPs. Suggested investments include institutional grants to national councils of science and technology; regional research bodies; universities for physical facilities; libraries and graduate field research; training in research management. Before either approving or rejecting these suggestions the Centre needs urgently to review its existing program activities, particularly those undertaken recently by what were formerly support and service Divisions. The Centre could get out of control and there could be serious duplication and conflict among Centre units if too many new program activity centres are allowed to proliferate.

The Centre's reputation has been built by professional scientists who combine knowledge of developing countries with a sound research background. This reputation is one that should not lightly be devalued. Before any serious move is made to offer institutional grants the Centre needs to decide precisely the conditions and criteria which will govern such grants, the process of selection, disbursement and monitoring, which units will be responsible for identification, formulation of conditions and monitoring.

E. INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION

1. Libraries: Documentation and Information Collection

Information related to the ROs can be classified into many different categories. In this discussion the following will be considered:

- (a) Information collected by the ROs;
- (b) Information needed by the ROs and their regional constituencies;
- (c) Information needed by the rest of IDRC.

The IS Librarian is reviewing the ROs' needs and will no doubt recommend how the ROs can gain better access to the data bases into which the HQ library is connected. As already stated (C3), several ROs receive far more documents than they can digest, process or systematically disseminate. It is hoped that the IS study will give first attention to this difficulty which is likely to be exacerbated as the Centre's activities continue to expand and diversify. To process the volume of formal, official and open literature received by the ROs is formidable enough. More difficult to digest, classify and systematically disseminate are the many informal memoranda, project progress, working group, consultant and staff trip reports. It would be a blessing to us all if every TR included an executive summary and a list of names

of people and institutions visited. It is strongly recommended that any sensitive information or comments be extracted from TRs and presented as separate "IDRC CONFIDENTIAL" memoranda distributed only to those who need to know.

The "grey" information from the above is often more useful to the Centre than open, catalogued and generally available printed copy. How best to use it requires particular attention by IS and Communications Division with suitable training for those in the ROs who have to process it.

In addition to all the above, the ROs, particularly the smaller ones, have to digest a wealth of documents from HQ: administrative and financial directives, project summaries, policy and position papers, various internal memoranda. One RO suggested the need for full time abstractors. An alternative may be to spread the reading load by assigning particular sets of documents to each RO staff member. Neither, however, offers a totally satisfactory solution. While accepting it is not the responsibility of IS POs in ROs to act as documentalists, training of RO support staff in information processing, and in standard filing systems is a responsibility IS could helpfully accept.

Only one RO employs a librarian. Whether each RO needs in-house libraries of basic texts and current journals is a matter of dispute even with ROs. Some POs and in-house project advisers feel isolated from essential scientific information. In ROs situated close to national and university libraries, several proposed that large in-house collections of texts and journals are unnecessary and uneconomic. By the same logic, a number of the same people, while commending IS for the excellence of its retrievals from data bases, questioned the need for a large Centre library. One Division's POs suggested that if and when more staff are posted to ROs, a large HQ library will become even less necessary.

One person proposed that IS decentralize by establishing, as projects, regional reference libraries close to but not within ROs. This is a proposition IS may wish to explore with ROs in countries where national library services are comparatively poorly endowed.

The essential general reference publications to be held in each RO will probably be decided during the present IS study. Whether IS or the RO budget should pay for them is a matter for CGT to decide. Since POs in HQ have ready access to many other libraries, a larger proportion of IS' library budget would probably be better used in providing essential texts and journals for POs in the ROs.

The ROs' respective capabilities to process information is conditioned both by staff and facilities. ASRO benefits from on-line connections with Ottawa, whereas MERO still awaits MICOM installations. The Centre is recognized for its unique competence in the technologies and systematics of information processing. It is hoped that some of this exceptional experience will help make less burdensome the ROs' information handling systems.

2. Between ROs and HQ

OPE has classified information needed by the Centre as:

- (i) Economic and social;
- (ii) National development policies;
- (iii) Research priorities and infrastructure;
- (iv) Donor agency activities;
- (v) Scientific and technical.

Facets of all five appear in the excellent RO quarterly and annual reports. It is however unrealistic to expect all ROs to collect, classify and pass on all that is of potential utility or interest to the Centre. The PDs and other HQ units need to examine and prescribe more precisely what information they need from the ROs on a regular basis in addition to what comes from TRs, project reports, workshops and other Centre activities. It would be helpful both to the ROs and to the Centre as a whole if the RO Coordinator could devote some attention to the Centre's needs for information and to assist the ROs in making a clear distinction between what is interesting and what is essential for present and probable future commitments.

Several people in ROs feel that information requested from HQ, even through the electronic mailbox, is often slow in delivery and sometimes inaccurate in content. Those responsible for IMIS and PROMIS in HQ attribute errors to data being inaccurately or inconsistently fed in by Program Divisions. People in HQ have ready access to the in-house expertise in data processing; employees in ROs do not, a fact to be borne in mind by those responsible for in-Centre training programs.

ROs which rely upon regular mail and courier services may wait up to two months for information requested from Ottawa. If the ROs are to increase in size and to expand their responsibilities for project administration, a first priority must be to improve systems of communication and to train all concerned in how to use the installed systems more effectively.

It has already been said, but deserves repetition, that ROs should be informed of all proposed visits by Centre staff to their regions; they should receive copies of all related TRs; and both HQ and ROs should distribute and revise quarterly their lists of proposed pipeline projects and other significant activities.

3. Between ROs and regional institutions

Various means by which the Centre could diversify its information services to governments and institutions in the regions were proposed. Many deserve consideration though several imply more technical assistance than support for research. Some of the RDs' proposals might well overlap with IS and Communications Division activities. These include support for libraries, journals, publications and information dissemination systems. Competitive overlap is probably best obviated by IS and Comm D being represented in the ROs by experienced POs.

Every project the Centre supports requires and generates knowledge and information. How best to deliver the information needed and to disseminate and apply the technology generated should be among the Centre's highest priorities. It is therefore argued that the Divisions most responsible for information and communications should be the ones most imaginatively and creatively decentralized.

F. STAFF - RO MANAGEMENT AND LOCALLY EMPLOYED

1. Regional Directors

Many of those interviewed volunteered their concepts of what characters, accomplishments and experience are desirable in an RD. The following came up most frequently:

- (a) Competence and experience in office administration and human resource management;
- (b) Comprehensive knowledge of IDRC's operational style, policies and procedures;
- (c) Desirably, indigenous to the region; essentially, a broad experience of and sympathetic rapport with the region and its people;
- (d) Awareness of the opportunities offered by applied research, the resources it needs and the principal factors by which it is constrained;
- (e) Ability to represent and publicize IDRC and to interpret the principal needs of the region to the Centre;
- (f) Exceptional capacity for hard work.

It has been the Centre's good fortune that most of these qualities are evident in many past and present RDs. They have not been, nor should they be identical clones. Each has placed his mark upon the style and scope of his RO. Without seeking to inhibit initiative or enterprise, the Centre is now of a size and complexity that each RD's authority and responsibility needs to be defined. Those who are less ambitious than others may need guidance and encouragement.

Relations between RDs, DRDs and the support staff directly responsible to them are less complicated than those between the RD and expatriates whose line responsibility is to their PDs. The direct line responsibility of POs to PDs or ADs should not be changed. The Centre's strength depends upon a high standard of professional specialization, a standard well maintained by the Program Divisions. It is, however, essential that POs in ROs keep RDs fully informed of their activities and consult regularly, particularly where matters of political, social or cultural sensitivity may arise. This requires that RDs give high priority to making themselves available to POs with sufficient frequency that timely and frank exchanges of information and advice can take place. It requires also that POs and PDs keep RDs informed in advance of divisional plans and intentions for the region.

If an RD feels a PO is acting or about to act in a manner prejudicial to the Centre's good relations with people in the region, he should say so privately to the person concerned. Only in extreme cases need critical memoranda be sent to Ottawa.

Serious conflicts of personality or judgement between RDs and Divisional POs have been remarkably rare. To maintain the established pattern of good relations it should be mandatory that every PO to be posted to an RO be interviewed by the RD before a final decision to transfer is made. In many instances such interviews have occurred and on at least two occasions the intention to post a PO was cancelled on the confidential advice of the RD. When PDs make annual assessments of POs in the ROs, the confidential advice of the RD on personal characters can be helpful.

The most important responsibilities of the RD are to manage the RO effectively, to represent the Centre to the region and the region to the Centre. By planned inter-Divisional meetings (as discussed in C9), and more frequent, less formal discussions, RDs can knit together the Centre's various activities; identify conflicts, overlaps and operational inconsistencies; and agree upon opportunities for new Centre initiatives.

2. Deputy Regional Director

A DRD is necessary when an RO is given extensive Phase C responsibilities and when the total resident staff exceeds 30 people. The DRD should be a deputy in fact, not just in name, with delegated authority to act as RD during the RD's absence. Each DRD should be well familiar with the region and spend sufficient time in HQ and, if possible, a more long-established RO, to become fully acquainted with the Centre's policies and procedures. DRDs who combine administrative experience with organizational ability can relieve the RD of many burdens. In selecting a DRD, RDs should analyze their own dispositions and select a person who will be both complementary and compatible.

3. Regional Controller

The RC is extremely important to the efficient operation of the RO and to the financial management and monitoring of projects and other Centre activities. RCs should be chosen and trained to exercise judgement and to make financial and budgetary decisions without constant reference to HQ.

Some RDs advocate that, while accepting policy and procedural direction from CGT, the RC should have a line responsibility to the RD. Whatever the pattern of responsibility, RCs need to be wholly familiar with the Centre's financial procedures. Where it is known that an RC is to resign or be transferred from an RO, a qualified person should be in training sufficiently far ahead to obviate discontinuity or a subsequent period of uncertain financial management. Two RDs proposed that RCs should spend at least one year in Ottawa before posting to an RO. Others proposed that senior staff in CGT, when recruited, should be as willing as POs to serve overseas.

Experienced RCs can assume greater responsibility for financial analyses, and give valuable assistance to POs in formulating and monitoring project budgets. The RCs effectiveness can be extended by well trained locally hired accountants and program administrators who, in turn, should be given delegated authority commensurate with their abilities.

Some modification to person-year allocations may occasionally be necessary to permit a temporary over-establishment in CGT where an RC, to be posted to an RO, is under training in Ottawa.

4. Support Staff

The support staff in all ROs offered helpful and constructive suggestions. Conditions of employment inevitably vary among ROs according to national labour laws and regulations. Some

inconsistencies, however, deserve the attention of HR. For example, some ROs do and others do not permit essential training (eg. language training) during working hours.

Almost all support staff seemed most intent upon improving their skills and raising their competence and qualifications. Since support staff salaries in the ROs are generally significantly lower than those in HQ (Table 2.A-F.), it would appear economic to increase progressively the ROs responsibility for administrative and financial administration. As Phase C responsibilities increase, competent trained program assistants (administrators) and accounts assistants are essential. It is not economic for POs to perform administrative and accounting functions which trained support staff are equally or better capable of carrying out.

Two ROs stated that, dependent upon the amount of equipment to be purchased under CAP budgets, a competent, trained program assistant can administer between 25 and 50 Phase C projects. One RO suggested the employment of locally hired purchasing agents both to administer project equipment procurement and to advise recipients on purchasing procedures, inventory management and related activities. Two RDs would prefer more program assistants than a purchasing agent.

Secretaries in most ROs seemed most interested in opportunities for training in essential languages (eg. Portuguese in EARO), in word processing and in improved office procedures. The opportunities for and advantages of specialized training for support staff in ROs is recommended to the attention of HR who might explore with others the desirability of short term exchanges between support staff in ROs and HQ.

Most ROs make regular surveys of salary levels offered by other public and private sector employees. To maintain the high quality of service most support staff provide, the ROs should be encouraged to maintain salary scales that are fully competitive with other employers. If, as it is hoped, IDRC ROs will remain competitive, support staff should be informed that they are among the highest paid. RDs and DRDs should make sure that the salaries offered attract the most competent staff.

G. PROGRAM STAFF

1. Selection, allocation, periods of posting

One RD offered the following as the essential qualities of a PO:

- (a) Scientific competence and research experience of a high order;

- (b) Easy relations with other people (lone rangers are not desirable;
- (c) Familiarity with the region;
- (d) Ability to work efficiently with secretarial and support staff;
- (e) Freedom from cultural prejudice or political bias;
- (f) Spouse and family sympathetic to the POs ambitions.

All RDs are opposed to posting inexperienced, newly graduated POs to the ROs. Since every PO recruited should be willing to serve overseas, due weight should be given in recruiting to previous overseas experience and maturity of disposition in addition to professional qualifications. RDs could helpfully outline to HR and to PDs particular attributes they consider desirable or undesirable for their regions.

No consistent view could be sensed concerning periods of postings to ROs or on any systematic procedure for staff rotations. Several stated that postings may be indefinite if the PO is content and performing satisfactorily. One PD feels strongly the need to move people every three to four years, with regular periods of service in Ottawa.

Of greater concern, particularly to POs, some RDs and DRDs, are their future career opportunities in IDRC or in other international agencies. Requests for staff development leave are discussed below. Several would welcome training in management skills to better fit them for senior positions that may become vacant in IDRC or in other organizations. HR is no doubt giving appropriate attention to longer term career planning for all Centre staff.

2. Briefing and Training

Though improvements have been made over time, most RDs consider that the briefing and training of POs and their families before posting to ROs are less than satisfactory. Several, including spouses, expressed a need for more comprehensive advance information on living conditions (the UN agencies provide duty station manuals). RDs suggest that whatever briefing HQ now offers is designed primarily for Canadians.

It was generally recommended that all POs be adequately briefed on Centre procedures particularly as they relate to project management. POs who are new to the Centre should spend at least three months in HQ before moving to an RO. Several support staff suggested that some POs need to be instructed in how to work most efficiently with secretaries. One young lady said "they treat us as if we have only a pair of hands and no brains". Many

secretaries possess the intellectual capacity and willingness to accomplish more than some POs request of them. HR may wish to consider how POs and secretaries may be encouraged to work more productively together. Similarly RDs could helpfully advise newly posted POs on working relations with Program Assistants and other support staff. It is uneconomic for POs to carry out tasks better undertaken by competent support staff.

3. Authority and Responsibility

When the ROs were first established the working relations between Program Division staff and the RDs were fairly well defined. POs reported in direct line to their PDs or ADs for all scientific, project development, monitoring and other professional responsibilities. They were to be guided by the RD in matters relative to behaviour and appropriate relations with the people of the region. This pattern of relations needs to be reaffirmed by PDs when POs are briefed for overseas postings. In addition, given the broad experience acquired by the ROs over the years, POs should be urged to seek the advice of RDs on countries and institutions they wish to visit but with which their Division is unfamiliar. Such advice is equally important for POs resident outside the RO territories.

Several RDs and POs commented that among and, in some cases, within Divisions the level of authority and responsibility delegated to POs is noticeably variable. Some POs complain of having to seek approval from HQ for what appear relatively minor decisions. Variability in authority among Divisions extends over ability to negotiate projects, to administer workshops, to select consultants, even to hospitality allowances. POs without Divisional hospitality allowances have to tap the RDs hospitality budget. It is clearly unsatisfactory for levels of authority to vary so widely among different Divisions. It is demoralizing for some Divisional representatives to feel inferior in status to others. While styles of management among Divisions will inevitably vary, certain levels of comparable authority need to be established among people of equivalent grades and titles.

POs who do not enjoy the full confidence of the PDs to act responsibly should not be posted to an RO. It is questionable if they should be employed in any location. POs, RCs and others posted to ROs cannot work efficiently without adequate authority, the scope and limits of which have been clearly defined. The job description is not sufficient for this purpose. Before posting each PO should be given a clear written statement of the extent and limits of responsibility and authority, for what decisions prior approval is needed from the PD, on what matters the RD's advice should be sought, and what actions and decisions the PO can make on

his/her own initiative. A pipeline list of projects and DAP activities together with early warning memoranda on proposed new projects can be approved in principle by PDs sufficiently ahead of time to permit POs and other staff in ROs to move forward without need for constant back reference to Ottawa.

Some POs feel that grades allocated to positions are not consistent across Divisions. This claim could not be verified within this review but perhaps merits examination by HR.

All POs in the ROs bear a very heavy workload, a load which increases with Phase C responsibilities. Decentralization of administrative authority to ROs to permit greater employment of local support staff in administrative and budgetary management and monitoring could relieve some of this burden. Nevertheless, all PDs and RDs should study and as far as possible compare the work loads borne by POs. RDs should give particular scrutiny to any marked differences among Divisions.

4. Staff Development Leave

Though opinions differ in the length of time expatriates should spend in an RO and whether there should be systematic rotations among ROs and HQ, the need for intellectual restoration and stimulus by staff development leave is widely felt. All the staff carry heavy work loads and though improved management could reduce some of the administrative burdens on POs, conscientious POs are inevitably committed to examine and advise upon many aspects of project management in addition to their scientific contributions. The Centre's policy and style discourages active involvement of POs in the research supported. They are thus deprived of the opportunity to publish and to add to their professional reputations in a conventional manner.

Several interesting suggestions deserve consideration:

- (a) POs be exchanged with Centre project and network advisers for up to one year;
- (b) Coop and PDs explore possible exchanges between POs and Canadian scientists taking study leave (such exchanges might be facilitated if Centre staff were spread more widely across Canada than if all are concentrated in Ottawa);
- (c) More people be allowed shorter periods of SDL rather than a few taking off for a year;
- (d) Encouragement to supervise graduate students in universities close to ROs. (Several AFNS staff based at Canadian universities have done so.)

- (e) Authority to RDs to employ part-time literature searchers to assist POs in writing and publishing state of scientific knowledge articles. ROs, in which most Divisions are represented, possess an almost unique in-house cross-disciplinary professional awareness of development research issues in their regions.

5. Family Conditions and Privileges

The various ROs use different arrangements for helping new arrivals to find accommodation and to settle in to the new environment. The most consistent criticism was of inadequate briefing sufficiently far ahead of the posting date. Many would welcome for each RO an IDRC publication which describes all that new arrivals need to know about living and working conditions. While some of the External Affairs publications are helpful, they are written primarily for Canadians to be posted to Embassies and High Commissions. If ROs, HR and/or Comm D agree to write "duty station" publications, they would be well advised to consult spouses and other dependents on what information should be included. An Ottawa concept of life overseas is not what is required.

Several spouses and dependents expressed disappointment at not being allowed to practise their professional skills except, on occasion, in some voluntary capacity. In most instances this is because of legitimate government regulations. It is important however that such regulations be made clear to POs and their dependents before overseas posting are finally decided. Even better, the prevalence of such regulations should be made known when people are first interviewed for employment with the Centre.

Though matters of personal and family security were raised, these will not be discussed since HR has them well in-hand. The subject should however be included in the proposed "Duty Station" publications.

FINAL NOTE

The RDs and their staff are extremely dedicated hard working people. They are however being overloaded, particularly in the smaller offices. The ROs cannot be all things to all Divisions and to all people in their region. They cannot provide comprehensive information services for HQ, the countries and agencies of their region, and for their own needs.

The need to determine for the ROs what are Centre priorities, as distinct from a mélange of independent program and support division priorities is urgent and is strongly recommended to the early attention of the President's and Management Committees.

A P P E N D I X "A"

TABLE 1.

THE COUNTRIES COVERED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICES

MERO

Algeria
Bahrain
Cyprus
Democratic Yemem
Egypt
Iran
Iraq
Jordan
Kuwait
Lebanon
Libya
Malta
Morocco
Oman
Qatar
Saudi Arabia
Sudan
Syria
Tunisia
Turkey
United Arab Emirates
Yemen

WARQ

Angola
Benin
Cameroon
Cape Verde
Chad
Congo
Central African Republic
Equatorial Guinea
Gabon
Gambia
Ghana
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Ivory Coast
Liberia
Mali
Mauritania
Niger
Nigeria
Senegal
Sierra Leone
Togo
Upper Volta
Zaire

TABLE 1. - Cont'd.

EARO

Botswana
Burundi
Comoros
Djibouti
Ethiopia
Kenya
Lesotho
Malagasy
Malawi
Mauritius
Mozambique
Rwanda
Seychelles
Somalia
Swaziland
Tanzania
Uganda
Zambia
Zimbabwe

ASRO

Afghanistan
? Bhutan
Brunei
Burma
China
Fiji
Hong Kong
Indonesia
Kampuchea
Laos
Malaysia
Papua New Guinea
Philippines
Singapore
South Korea
Thailand
Tonga
Viet Nam

TABLE 1. - Cont'd.

SARO

Bangladesh

India

Maldives

Nepal

Pakistan

Sri Lanka

LARO

Antigua

Argentina

Bahamas

Barbados

Belize

Bolivia

Brazil

Chile

Colombia

Costa Rica

Cuba

Dominica

Dominican Republic

Ecuador

El Salvador

Grenada

Guatemala

Guyana

Haiti

Honduras

Jamaica

Mexico

Nicaragua

Panama

Paraguay

Peru

Saint Lucia

Saint Vincent

Surinam

Trinidad and Tobago

Uruguay

Venezuela

TABLE 2.A

**ASRO - POPULATION, PROJECTS AND SALARY COSTS
AS OF 1984/03/31**

REGIONAL INFORMATION	
Countries	Population
18	1.5 billion

PROJECTS	
Phase C * 1/	Total* 2/
272	532
\$40,504,541	\$67,060,053

APP.YRLY SALARY COST (CAD)	
Prog. Assistant	Secretary
\$13,900 to \$27,400	\$5,700 to \$14,100

Notes:

- * 1. If SARO projects included in totals, figures would be:

Phase C	Total
<u>344</u>	<u>686</u>
\$52,495,854	\$92,192,253

- * 2. Total projects in region covered by Regional Office, including Phase C, where applicable.

TABLE 2.B

**EARO - POPULATION, PROJECTS AND SALARY COSTS
AS OF 1984/03/31**

REGIONAL INFORMATION	
Countries	Population
19	153 million

PROJECTS	
Phase C	Total*
9	201
\$2,100,330	\$31,920,629

APP.YRLY SALARY COST (CAD)	
Prog. Assistant	Secretary
\$8,700	\$4,100 to \$9,300

Notes:

* Total projects in region covered by Regional Office,
including Phase C, where applicable.

TABLE 2.C

LARO - POPULATION, PROJECTS AND SALARY COSTS
AS OF 1984/03/31

REGIONAL INFORMATION	
Countries	Population
32	405 million

PROJECTS	
Phase C	Total*
96	638
\$19,689,155	\$87,674,605

APP.YRLY SALARY COST (CAD)	
Prog. Assistant	Secretary
\$13,900	\$8,200 to \$13,400

Note:

* Total projects in region covered by Regional Office,
Phase C, where applicable.

TABLE 2.D

**MERO - POPULATION, PROJECTS AND SALARY COSTS
AS OF 1984/03/31**

REGIONAL INFORMATION	
Countries	Population
22	270 million

PROJECTS	
Phase C	Total*
-	140
-	\$24,556,758

APP.YRLY SALARY COST (CAD)	
Prog. Assistant	Secretary
\$5,600	\$4,614

Notes:

* Total projects in region covered by Regional Office, including Phase C, where applicable.

TABLE 2.E

**SARO - POPULATION, PROJECTS AND SALARY COSTS
AS OF 1984/03/31**

REGIONAL INFORMATION	
Countries	Population
6	984 million

PROJECTS	
Phase C *1/	Total* 2/
72	154
\$11,991,313	\$25,132,200

APP.YRLY SALARY COST (CAD)	
Prog. Assistant	Secretary
	\$5,544 to \$8,316

Notes:

- * 1. These continue to be handled by ASRO.
- * 2. Total projects in region covered by Regional Office, including Phase C, where applicable.

TABLE 2.F

**WARO - POPULATION, PROJECTS AND SALARY COSTS
AS OF 1984/03/31**

REGIONAL INFORMATION	
Countries	Population
24	219 million

PROJECTS	
Phase C *	Total*
-	224
-	\$33,389,018

APP.YRLY SALARY COST (CAD)	
Prog. Assistant	Secretary
	\$6,100 to \$11,100

Note:

- * Total projects in region covered by Regional Office, including Phase C, where applicable.

TABLE 3.A

ASRO - STAFF AND OFFICE SPACE UP TO 1984/03/31 AND PROJECTED TO 1988/89

	STAFF		OFFICE SPACE(SQ.M)	
	Prof.*	Support	\$CAD/Mo.	Occupied
1970/71				
1971/72	1	3		
1972/73	3	9		
1973/74	5	17		
1974/75	7	19	7.10	411
1975/76	7	20	7.59	411
1976/77	11	23	7.06	411
1977/78	11	23	8.55	739
1978/79	11	24	9.84	739
1979/80	11	28	10.57	739
1980/81	12	29	11.89	739
1981/82	13	31	12.35	739
1982/83	13	30	12.55	739
1983/84	15	29	31.12	739
1984/85	17	32	33.72	743
1985/86	17	32	33.72	743
1986/87	18	32	?	743
1987/88	18	32	?	743
1988/89	18	32	?	743
PROJECTED GROWTH/YR.	3.7%	2.0%	?	0.1%

*Incl. RD, DRD and Admin. Off.

TABLE 3.B

EARO - STAFF AND OFFICE SPACE UP TO 1984/03/31 AND PROJECTED TO 1988/89

	STAFF		OFFICE SPACE(SQ.M)	
	Prof.*	Support	\$CAD/Mo.	Occupied
1970/71 1971/72 1972/73 1973/74 1974/75				
1975/76 1976/77 1977/78 1978/79 1979/80	2 9 11 -	12 16 18 -	4.59 6.64 6.01 -	527 527 527 -
1980/81 1981/82 1982/83 1983/84 1984/85 1985/86 1986/87 1987/88 1988/89	3 6 6 11 12 16 19 21 21	3 7 12 16 23 31 36 42 44	11.41 11.18 9.26 8.11 7.98 8.38 8.80 9.68 10.65	73 470 470 470 830 830 1,350 1,350 1,350
PROJECTED GROWTH/YR.	13.8%	22.4%	5.6%	23.5%

*Incl. RD, DRD and Admin. Off.

TABLE 3.C

LARO - STAFF AND OFFICE SPACE UP TO 1984/03/31 AND PROJECTED TO 1988/89

	STAFF		OFFICE SPACE(SQ.M)	
	Prof.*	Support	\$CAD/Mo.	Occupied
1970/71				
1971/72				
1972/73				
1973/74	5	14	2.71	
1974/75	9	15	2.65	
1975/76	9	25	2.79	
1976/77	7	28	3.40	
1977/78	9	30	4.00	
1978/79	9	28	4.46	937
1979/80	7	26	6.35	937
1980/81	6	21	6.38	812
1981/82	8	20	7.01	812
1982/83	9	23	11.30	812
1983/84	9	25	11.82	1,205
1984/85	17	31	11.95	1,205
1985/86	20	33	12.55	1,205
1986/87	22	36	13.18	1,205
1987/88	23	39	14.89	1,300
1988/89	23	39	16.38	1,300
PROJECTED GROWTH/YR.	20.6%	9.3%	6.7%	1.5%

*Incl. RD, DRD and Admin. Off.

TABLE 3.D

MERO - STAFF AND OFFICE SPACE UP TO 1984/03/31 AND PROJECTED TO 1988/89

	STAFF		OFFICE SPACE(SQ.M)	
	Prof.*	Support	\$CAD/Mo.	Occupied
1970/71 1971/72 1972/73 1973/74 1974/75				
1975/76	6	11	-	600
1976/77	2	10	5.00	250
1977/78	3	11	5.00	250
1978/79	3	11	5.00	250
1979/80	4	9	5.00	300
1980/81	2	8	5.00	300
1981/82	1	5	7.50	240
1982/83	1	5	7.50	240
1983/84	4	7	7.50	240
1984/85	5	10	11.36	550
1985/86	7	12	12.50	550
1986/87	10	15	13.75	550
1987/88	10	15	15.13	550
1988/89	10	15	16.64	550
PROJECTED GROWTH/YR.	20.1%	16.5%	17.3%	18.0%

*Incl. RD, DRD and Admin. Off.

TABLE 3.E

SARO - STAFF AND OFFICE SPACE UP TO 1984/03/31 AND PROJECTED TO 1988/89

	STAFF		OFFICE SPACE(SQ.M)	
	Professional	Support	\$CAD/Mo.	Occupied
1970/71				
1971/72				
1972/73				
1973/74				
1974/75				
1975/76				
1976/77				
1977/78				
1978/79				
1979/80				
1980/81				
1981/82				
1982/83				
1983/84	4	5	12.68	569
1984/85	6	14	12.68	569
1985/86	10	18	12.68	569
1986/87	13	20	12.68	569
1987/88	15	23	15.44	569
1988/89	15	26	16.39	569
PROJECTED GROWTH/YR.	30.3%	39.1%	5.3%	-

*Incl. RD, DRD and Admin. Off.

TABLE 3.F

WARO - STAFF AND OFFICE SPACE UP TO 1984/03/31 AND PROJECTED TO 1988/89

	STAFF		OFFICE SPACE(SQ.M)	
	Professional	Support	\$CAD/Mo.	Occupied
1970/71				
1971/72				
1972/73				
1973/74	7	4	6.66	147
1974/75	9	10	6.03	147
1975/76	8	18	14.06	400
1976/77	9	17	12.22	400
1977/78	9	19	12.82	400
1978/79	7	13	14.98	400
1979/80	7	13	16.31	400
1980/81	8	15	16.39	400
1981/82	8	16	9.61	500
1982/83	7	16	8.77	500
1983/84	7	16	8.47	500
1984/85	7	16	7.76	500
1985/86	-	-	-	-
1986/87	-	-	-	-
1987/88	-	-	-	-
1988/89	-	-	-	-
PROJECTED GROWTH/YR.	-	-	-	-

*Incl. RD, DRD and Admin. Off.

TABLE 4.

COMPARATIVE STUDY - COSTS OF SENDING & KEEPING PROGRAM OFFICERS
AT REGIONAL OFFICES (Married with 2 children - \$ 40 K/Yr.)

(as of 1984/03/31)

DESCRIPTION	ASRO	LARO	WARO	EARO	MERO	SARO	Notes:
1. Accommodation (4 weeks max.)							
(a) Hotels	1,700	1,415	2,300	1,300	2,350	1,400	
(b) Per Diems @ 75%	2,850	3,020	3,020	2,520	3,360	1,930	
SubTotal	4,550	4,435	5,320	3,820	5,710	3,330	
2. Moving and Packing							
(a) Moving	7,000	8,000	8,000	10,000	9,000	-	
(b) Incidentals Allow.	500	500	500	500	500	500	1.
(c) Residual Effects	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,750	2.
SubTotal	9,000	10,000	10,000	12,000	11,000	2,250	
3. Airfares(one way)	5,600	4,900	4,470	5,330	4,165	5,785	3.
I. Total "One-Time" Costs	19,150	19,335	19,790	21,150	20,875	11,365	
1. Overseas Allowances	6,380	5,800	6,380	5,800	5,800	5,800	4.
2. Housing Allowance	19,300	12,600	8,200	5,400	12,600	7,000	
3. Utilities & Security	5,000	5,200	5,100	3,000	1,500	1,000	
4. AirFares							
(a) Annual Leave (for four)	11,200	9,800	8,940	10,660	8,330	11,570	
(b) Staff Meeting (for one)	2,500	1,100	1,870	2,340	1,500	1,900	5.
5. Depreciation Expense							
(a) Automobiles	3,000	3,000	4,500	3,750	3,000	3,000	6.
(b) Household Furniture	-	-	-	-	-	3,600	7.
II. Total Annual Costs	47,380	37,500	34,990	30,950	32,730	33,870	
TOTALS =====	66,530	56,835	54,870	52,100	53,605	45,235	

III. Other Observations

- Exchange Rate Exposure - Difficult to predict. May be positive or negative, depending on movements of local currency and/or Cdn\$ rates.
- Regional Office
 - (a) Additional Office Space - These are characteristically step-variable costs, in which probable savings might occur at Head Office.
 - (b) Office Furniture & Equip.
 - (c) Additional support staff.
- Education allowances - not included in figures above. Maximum allowances are:
 - At post - \$ 6,000 per dependent, and
 - Away from post - \$ 6,500 per dependent, plus one return airfare per year.
- "One-Time" costs refer to sending employee only. Costs at repatriation time would have similar costs.

TABLE 4. - Cont'd.

NOTES TO STUDY:

1. Assumes utilization of full 11,000 lbs. gross shipping limit.
2. Assumes utilization of storage of residual household effects. Yearly cost of insurance approximately \$ 200.00.
3. Assumes 3 and $\frac{1}{2}$ fares - one of the children over 12 years of age.
4. Varies according to Post Index at each Regional Office.
5. Assumes 14 day excursion fare for one, once a year.
6. Depreciation expense for first year. Expense would drop in succeeding years as calculated on declining balance. Net cost would depend on residual values, if any, at time of disposition.

Comparative capital costs are:

- ASRO, LARO, MERO, and SARO - \$10,000 per vehicle.
 - WARO - \$15,000 per vehicle.
 - EARO - \$12,500 per vehicle.
7. Capital costs of \$12,0000 with same comments as in note 6. This item applies only to SARO, where the non-accountable assignment allowance would not be an option.

TABLE 5.

ANALYSIS OF INFLATION VS. DEVALUATION BY REGIONAL OFFICES

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>LOCAL C.O.L.</u> ¹ %	<u>CAD\$ DEVALUATION</u> %	<u>NET EFFECT ON CAD\$ PURCHASING POWER</u> %
<u>ASRO</u> <u>Singapore</u>			
1977	3.3 ³	(11.7) ²	15.0-
1978	4.7	(13.7)	18.4-
1979	4.1	(2.8)	6.9-
1980	10.8	(2.9)	13.7-
1981	8.2	(4.1)	12.8-
1982	<u>3.9</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>3.8-</u>
PER ANNUM	5.8	(6.1)	11.9-
 <u>EARO</u> <u>Kenya</u>			
1977	14.9	(11.3)	26.2-
1978	17.0	(13.1)	30.1-
1979	8.0	(3.6)	11.6-
1980	13.8	3.5	10.3-
1981	11.8	32.6	20.8+
1982	<u>25.0</u>	<u>20.2</u>	<u>4.8-</u>
PER ANNUM	15.0	3.5	11.8-
 <u>LARO</u> <u>Colombia</u>			
1977	33.0	(3.1)	36.1-
1978	17.8	0.7	17.1-
1979	24.7	4.5	20.2-
1980	26.5	15.9	10.6-
1981	27.5	13.1	14.4-
1982	<u>24.6</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>11.5-</u>
PER ANNUM	25.6	7.5	18.8-

TABLE 5. - Cont'd.

ANALYSIS OF INFLATION VS. DEVALUATION BY REGIONAL OFFICES

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>LOCAL C.O.L.¹</u> %	<u>CAD\$</u> <u>DEVALUATION</u> %	<u>NET EFFECT ON CAD\$</u> <u>PURCHASING POWER</u> %
<u>MERO</u>			
<u>Egypt</u>			
1977	12.8	(7.3)	20.1-
1978	11.0	(6.8)	17.8-
1979	9.9	(45.6)	55.5-
1980	20.6	0.2	20.4-
1981	10.4	(2.5)	12.9-
1982	<u>14.9</u>	<u>(2.8)</u>	<u>17.7-</u>
PER ANNUM	13.2	(12.6)	25.8-
 <u>SARO</u>			
<u>India</u>			
1977	8.4	(14.3)	22.7-
1978	2.6	(7.0)	9.6-
1979	6.3	(6.0)	12.3-
1980	11.5	0.5	11.0-
1981	13.0	11.8	1.2-
1982	<u>7.9</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>4.9-</u>
PER ANNUM	8.2	(2.4)	10.5-
 <u>WARO</u>			
<u>Senegal</u>			
1977	11.4	(12.2)	23.6-
1978	3.3	(17.2)	20.5-
1979	9.8	(6.3)	16.1-
1980	8.7	12.5	3.8+
1981	5.9	24.1	18.2+
1982	<u>17.3</u>	<u>13.7</u>	<u>3.6-</u>
PER ANNUM	9.3	1.3	8.1-

TABLE 5. - Cont'd.

NOTES:

1

C.O.L. = Consumer Price Index

2

() = negative % meaning revaluation or reduced purchasing power of CAD\$ in local terms.

3

All figures are as of year end.

ANALYSIS

The above charts indicate that the combined effect of inflation and devaluation against the Canadian dollar (in the countries hosting IDRC Regional Offices) has been reduced purchasing power of the Canadian dollar. The net effect varies from an average of 8.1% annual decrease in Senegal to 25.8% annual decrease in purchasing power in Egypt. In other words, the purchasing power of CAD\$ 1.00 in 1976 was reduced to the following amounts by the end of 1982.

	<u>1976</u>	<u>1982</u>
SINGAPORE	\$1.00	\$0.47
KENYA	1.00	0.47
COLOMBIA	1.00	0.29
EGYPT	1.00	0.17
INDIA	1.00	0.51
SENEGAL	1.00	<u>0.60</u>
Weighted Average		0.43
CANADA	1.00	0.53

To compare the overall reduced purchasing power of the Canadian dollar in the six Regional Offices to the effect of inflation within Canada, a weighted average of 1983/84 budgeted Regional Office program operational expenditures was taken in 1976 dollars. This average of \$0.43, shown above, demonstrates that host countries have been reluctant to devalue their currency sufficiently to keep pace with their inflation. As a result, the 1976 Canadian dollar was worth only \$0.43 on average by the end of 1982 while the 1976 Canadian dollar in Canada was still worth \$0.53.

Regional Office budgets should take account of this trend, even though currency fluctuations are highly unpredictable.

TABLE 6.

REGIONAL DIRECTORS' DISCRETIONARY FUND - No. of Activities & Cost

	<u>1981/82</u>	<u>1982/83</u>	<u>1983/84</u>
<u>ASRO</u>			
No.	45	36	53
Cost	\$105,649	\$142,204	\$209,543
 <u>EARO</u>			
No.	8	24	24
Cost	24,567	83,270	103,824
 <u>LARO</u>			
No.	19	41	47
Cost	21,846	112,193	148,118
 <u>MERO</u>			
No.	4	8	9
Cost	8,450	23,156	17,862
 <u>SARO</u>			
No.			3
Cost			17,605
 <u>WARO</u>			
No.	3	18	23
Cost	12,300	58,904	93,741

A P P E N D I X "B"

APPENDIX "B"

FORD FOUNDATION

The Ford Foundation's style of operation is in sharp contrast to IDRC's. The following notes were made following a visit to FF's Nairobi office.

Locations

FF has eight regional offices in LDCs.

In Africa FF has offices in Cairo, with a sub-office in Khartoum; Dakar, with a sub-office in Lagos; and in Nairobi.

Budget

Only one third of FF's budget is committed to developing countries. Budget allocations are made during the annual program review in New York when the Regional Offices compete with one another for funds available. The Annual Review includes an examination of each office's activities over the previous year; the general program and budgetary proposals for the coming year. Each Regional Director defends his program and project proposals and the two components of the office's budget:

- a) Operating - rent, administration, salaries
- b) Grants to recipients

All grants are either approved or recommended by the Regional Director. The specialist staff in New York hold an advisory rather than an executive line responsibility. The Ford Foundation Global Budget and allocations in the USA are administered from New York.

The Regional Director may approve all grants up to \$ 50,000 US. All grants above \$ 50,000 are approved in New York though these approvals are generally regarded as automatic, the RD having earlier submitted a pre-notification memorandum outlining the essential nature of the proposal.

There is a reserve budget held in New York for special and unanticipated activities.

Regional budgets are classified under broad category headings such as:

- a) Government and Public Policy
- b) Land and water management
- c) Rural poverty

RDs also give grants for cultural and artistic activities.

Project grants fall into three general categories:

- a) Grants to individuals
- b) Small program activities
- c) Major grants

a) and b) are usually below (c) above \$50,000.

The total annual budget for Africa is about \$3.5 million. In East and Southern Africa one-third goes to Kenya, one-third to Zimbabwe and one-third to the rest of the region.

Project administration

Project proposals consist of 4 - 8 pages of relatively simple description with very little methodological detail. Budgets are simple consisting of no more than five line items. Maximum duration is usually two to three years. If a second phase is anticipated this is usually stated in the initial proposal.

Very little support is given to technical research; most goes to social sciences, policy research and cultural activities. FF regards itself more as a funding agency than having responsibility for technical cooperation and assistance.

Staff

The small regional staff are mainly people of broad rather than specialised backgrounds though this was not always the case. Each is expected to straddle a range of sectoral disciplines and activities. The FF offices do not fulfil a detailed monitoring and advisory function comparable to IDRCs POs.

Since FF activities are concentrated in relatively few countries their staff do not travel nearly so frequently or extensively as IDRCs.

Clearly FF's style and scope differs significantly from IDRCs and its organisational structure and procedure appears unsuited to IDRCs present policy and program.